

# TEP COMMISSION PAPER ON THE PROLETARIAT AND ON POLITICAL POSITIONS IN MCLL!

A revolution is not a dinner party, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing embroidery; it cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous. A revolution is an insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another.



This paper represents the thinking and struggle of the TEP commission. Not all TEP cadre agree with all parts of this paper. And some TEP cadre are still in the process of developing their own positions. But TEP unanimously agrees that this paper represents the level of discussion required in this period.



Note: In writing this paper we have attempted to adopt the style of writing discussed by Mao in "Oppose the Party "Eight-Legged Essay"

What we oppose is the long-winded 'eight-legged essay' void of matter, but we do not mean that all good writings should be short. Of course we need short articles in war-time, but above all we need articles that have substance. (p. 50)...

Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that the masses cannot assimilate our decisions unless we learn to speak the language which the masses understand. We do not always know how to speak simply, concretely, in images which are familiar and intelligible to the masses.

#### TEP PAPER ON THE PROLETARIAT

1. The fundamental contradiction of capitalism is that between the form of organization of the means of production and the social relations of production.

2. Consequently, the main struggle is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

3. On an international scale, the main struggle of the world's peoples is against imperialism.\*

4. The way to prevent imperialism from clinging to vitality through neo-colonialism is for the national liberation struggles to be socialist as well as nationalist.

5. Socialist national liberation struggles and revolutions can only be led by the proletariat.

6. Thus, the proletariat is the international revolutionary class and must lead the fight against imperialism:

- a. through socialist states led by a proletarian dictatorship;
- b. through socialist national liberation struggles led by Communist parties at the core of a national united front against imperialism and at the head of a worker-peasant alliance;
- c. through socialist revolutions in the capitalist countries led by a communist party.

Points (a) through (c) are principles contradictions within the fundamental contradiction of class struggle -- the proletariat versus the bourgeoisie. The analysis of this contradiction, and the contradictions that follow from it, is dependent upon one's place, historically and geographically.

"As we have said, one must not treat all the contradictions in a process as being equal but must distinguish between the principal and the secondary contradictions, and pay special attention to grasping the principle one. But, in any given contradiction, whether principal or secondary, should the two contradictory aspects be treated as equal? Again, no. In any contradiction the development of the contradictory aspects is uneven. Sometimes they seem to be in equilibrium, which is however only temporary and relative, while unevenness is basic. Of the two contradictory aspects, one must be principle and the other secondary. The principal aspect is the one playing the leading role in the contradiction. The nature of a thing is determined mainly by the principle aspect of a contradiction, the aspect which has gained the dominant position.

But this situation is not static; The principal and the non-principal aspects of a contradiction transform themselves into each other and the nature of the thing changes accordingly.

(Mao, "On Contradiction, Part IV)

\*The nature of imperialism -- whether its current form reflects struggles between the bourgeoisie of nation-states or whether there is a process of change and the emergence of an international bourgeoisie needs more study and analysis.

The analysis of the proletariat in the United States in 1973 cannot be separated from the form the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie takes in this era of imperialism. The class analysis carried out by Marx, Engels, and Lenin must now be carried out within the context of the four contradictions cited by the Chinese Communist Party:

- the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp;
- the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in oppressed countries;
- the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism; and
- the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

Analyzing the class struggle in the United States requires that we also analyze the nature and inter-relationships of the above contradictions. That analysis has begun in TEP but has only begun. Thus, the class analysis that follows is under-developed in so much as it lacks a statement of these relationships.

Marxists-leninists use scientific theory for their own period of history. Applying such a theory involves its own contradiction. On one hand, there are certain fundamental relationships in human history that are always the force for social change. On the other hand, human beings create "new" history and society is ever-changing. Both the "same" and the "different" are always present. To concentrate only on what is the "same" through human history is to become doctrinaire. To concentrate only on what is different is to become exceptionalist. We must understand how to do both.

Marx argued that the most important contradiction developed within the social relationships of human beings in conflict around the organization of the means of production...that there were many who worked and created value which was only partially returned to them and there were a few who owned the means of production and took the extra value created (surplus value) from the labor of others. Those few who owned were the bourgeoisie, and capitalism was in their interest. They were the ownership class. Those many who sold their labor to the bourgeoisie, and who created value through socialized means of production (i.e. they worked in co-operative collective relationship to one another) and who only got back enough to basically live on were the proletariat. Marx also understood that there were other classes. Some of these classes, in Marx's time, had interests that placed them "in-between" the interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat -- the petite bourgeoisie and the intellectuals, for example. Another class, the peasantry, owned their own small plots of land and thus owned their own means of production but suffered under capitalist modes of trade and exchange. The peasantry could come to understand that its interests best lay with the proletariat.

For Marx, however, the key to class analysis was the conflict between the interests of the bourgeoisie and the interests of the proletariat. These were the major classes of capitalism and the contradiction between them was the driving force of social change. This contradiction created secondary contradictions -- questions of class alliances, sexism, racism, etc. -- but Marx argued that secondary contradictions could only be understood once the basic contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie was understood.

Lenin added to Marx's analysis by analyzing how the forces generated by class conflict were molded and directed through a form -- the party. The party represent the organized and articulated conscious interests of the proletariat, which then gave leadership to other classes in whose interests it was to overthrow the bourgeoisie. Thus, before one can discuss the party led by the proletariat, one must be very clear as to who and what the proletariat is. This paper will use Lenin's definition of class -- a definition that has four basic parts. The focus will be on the historical and contemporary development of the US proletariat and bourgeoisie. Such an analysis raises as many questions as it answers. But this is a beginning and ongoing organizational discussion, and struggle will add to and clarify this analysis.

#### LENIN'S DEFINITION OF CLASS:

"And what does the 'abolition of classes' means? All those who call themselves socialists recognize that this is the ultimate goal of socialism, but by no means give all thought to its significance. Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in an historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated by law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of



which can appropriate the labor of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.

(From "A Great Beginning". June 28, 1919)

I. ...by the place they occupy in an historically determined system of social production...

The social production of US 1973 has undergone great changes since the time of Marx and Lenin. The factory as the major unit of industrial production and the bank as the major unit of commercial transaction have been replaced by the corporation, which is multi-industrial, multi-financial (banks, life insurance companies, investment houses, etc.) and multi-national. Marx predicted that capital and manufacture would consolidate and form monopoly. What Marx did not (and could not) do was predict how monopoly capital on an national and international scale would affect the social relationships around production. (Although Marx did set forth some general outlines of prediction.) The historically determined system of social production has undergone changes from that of a factory system run by owner/boss to that of the corporation run by "line management" working for a financial/industrial international or national bourgeoisie. The continued accumulation of capital, the continued application of technology, not only in material production but also as a "science of human relationships" also has real consequences for the analysis of contemporary class.

As the forms of material production have developed historically, so has the form of the state. In Marx's time, the state included the police, military, a lawmaking body, and a relatively small bureaucracy. Marx understood this state to be the instrument of the ruling class which enforced the social relationships of capitalism -- mainly for the benefit of the bourgeoisie.

"By the mere fact that it is a class and no longer an estate, the bourgeoisie is forced to organize itself no longer locally but nationally\*, and to give a general form to its mean average interest. Through the emancipation of private property from the community, the State has become a separate entity, beside and outside civil society; but it is nothing more than the form of organization which the bourgeoisie necessarily adopt both for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests.

(\*And now internationally. TEP addition)

...and Ideology

In contemporary US society, the state assumes a far different form, although its essential relationship to the bourgeoisie and the proletariat has not changed. Today the state assumes a major role in organizing and supporting a significant sector of the work forces which is in a service relationship to workers hired directly by the bourgeoisie. (See discussion below on the service sector of the proletariat). The state, also, to some extent produces material goods (e.g. the TVA), conducts research, and intervenes in the economy. Clearly, the historical development of the means of production and the historical development of the state are inseparable.

II. ...by their relation to the means of production...

The basic contradiction of class has not been altered in this period. There are still workers who are exploited (who create surplus value) but who also work on socialized means of production. What has changed in this period, however, is the emergence of large sectors of workers who do not directly create material value but who are also exploited, who also work in socialized forms of production, and whose work is necessary for the continued production of material value -- teachers, social workers, postal workers, recreation workers, day care workers, restaurant workers). There are also sectors of the work force which do not belong in the proletariat. These sectors do not own their means of production but get returned to them, in the form of salaries, stock options, bonuses, and tax exemptions, etc. a compensation for their work which equals or exceeds the value they create. (IE they are not exploited.) This could be called an "administrative class". And there are others who have a more ambiguous relationship to the social relationship around production -- houseworkers, unemployed workers, prison workers, workers engaged in production that doesn't create value except for the needs of capitalism (stock brokers, real estate and insurance agents, etc.). These may be the basis of other classes and further study and analysis is necessary to understand the relationship of such workers to the proletariat. The important point for this paper is that the nature and form of the classes observed by Marx in mid-1800 England have undergone important changes and we must understand those changes.

There not only remains a proletariat but that proletariat has expanded as a sector of the work force, as Marx had predicted it would. Marx understood that the driving force of monopoly capitalism is such as to "drive-out" the in-between classes and to

force more and more workers into the ranks of the proletariat. But at the same time that this happened, the nature of the proletariat itself has changed. This confuses Radicals who look only for the expansion of "workers at the point of production because that's what Marx talked about", and leads to US exceptionalism. Failing to find an increase in point of production workers some US Radicals then argue that the "leading force" of contemporary US society must be something other than the proletariat. At the same time, bourgeois ideology argues that the historical differentiation of the proletariat is "really the disappearance of Marx's proletariat" and argues that instead we have an upper-middle class, a lower-middle class, an upper-lower class, and a lower-lower class. Now, according to bourgeois ideology, we have classes distinguished by education, skill, culture, income, race, etc.

Thus, a major contradiction in this period has been that at the historical time in which the proletariat is undergoing rapid expansion and the material basis for unity has been laid, bourgeois ideology has proclaimed the opposite and US Radicals, confused by a donstrinaire reading of Marx or by Sociology 101, have been unable to explain the contradictions.

The expansion of the proletariat has come about primarily as the result of the changing basis of the petite bourgeoisie -- urban and rural. At a time when capitalism was competitive and the means of production less technologically advanced, the petite bourgeoisie (small shopowners, small farmers, small craftsman, skilled professionals) served capitalism more effectively as "independent" producers of value. But as monopoly increased, the work done by the petite bourgeoisie was increasingly absorbed by the corporation (the big department store or chain store, the corporate conglomerate, the agri-corporation, etc.) The sons and daughters of the petite bourgeoisie took roles in the corporate structure. Of then they assumed roles which they were told were privileged because of the "brain" component of the work, because of its relationship to advanced technology (for example, a computer operator), because of the relative job security, or because of the greater formal training required. Thus, the computer operator had to have a BA in mathematics although his skill was learned largely on the job and in technical expertise did not require much different aptitude than a skilled tradesman. But the college degree and the white collar became symbols of the fact that somehow the job was "different".. The corporate mythology fed and encouraged this perception.

But the point is that the objective relationship to the means of production had been altered for these sons and daughters of the petite bourgeoisie. The sons of the small shopkeeper became a personnel manager for Woolworths and no longer owned his means of production, no longer had a material basis for what Marx and Lenin identified as the petite bourgeoisie mentality. Indeed, the individualism and competitiveness of the petite bourgeoisie mentality was systematically destroyed by the corporation in pursuit of the "corporation man" -- lack of individualism, identification with group goals, motivation by standards of "professionalism", etc. Thus, as more workers were objectively proletarianized, they were, at the same time, given an ideology of privilege, an ideology of identification with the form of the bourgeoisie (the corporation) and inculcated with anti-working class ideology.

This process can be illustrated by an analysis of the class background of one of our own comrades. X is a skilled technocrat working for one of the Big Three. X's father owned a gift shop in Royal Oak. He was a fairly successful businessman and was a member of what would be called the petite bourgeoisie. When Northland was built X's father had a choice to go into Northland or keep his independence. He made a decision and understood the consequences of not joining Northland. The result was that he was driven out of business. But at the same time that X's father was fighting for his own petite bourgeoisie survival he encouraged X to go to a "good college" and acquire a business skill that would allow him to be hired by



Lenin understood the danger of the "petite bourgeoisie mentality" for a working class movement and understood that often proletarian elements become infused with that mentality. For this historical period, the "corporate mentality" must be as clearly understood -- the identification with the corporate well-being and belief in the power of the corporation. There must be a struggle with sectors of the proletariat who would infuse that mentality into a working class movement and an analysis of the basis for that mentality and a strategy for defeating it. This is not to deny that remnants of the old petite bourgeoisie mentality also exist, for superstructural changes always embody both the old and the new.

Other elements of the petite bourgeoisie have also entered the work force as members of the "administrative class" -- i.e. they do not own the means of production, but they are hired to administer the corporate apparatus or state apparatus and are paid well. And there continue to be some who are still petite bourgeoisie.

Like the petite bourgeoisie, the intellectual class was, a hundred years ago, an "in-between" class. Intellectuals were hired to teach and serve the bourgeoisie -- a "factory hand" didn't need "formal education". Today, most intellectuals' work is to service other workers -- not the sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie. Thus, the material basis of the intellectual class as a class has undergone change. (This will also be elaborated in terms of service workers -- see below). With the exception of those like Harvard professor, headmasters of private schools and scientists working for the RAND corporation -- a small group proportionately -- the relationship of most intellectuals to the means of production has changed (although the Harvard professors, etc. still constitute a classical intellectual class. There is now a difference based on the relationships of ~~most~~ intellectuals in terms of the work they do, by whom they are hired, and who they serve. Those differences have pushed a large part of what once was called an "intellectual class" into the ranks of the proletariat as intellectual workers.

III. ...by their role in the social organization of labor...

The proletariat has grown larger; its characteristics have changed as forms of production have changed. An analysis of WHY these changes have occurred points to two factors that must be understood.

A. The development of technology.

Technology has led to the increasing productivity of labor. That productivity allows fewer workers, proportionately, to produce the material necessities of the society. The historical accumulation of capital has meant that several generations of industrial labor has built up. Thus, today's industrial worker, agricultural worker, and miner creates more material with less individual labor power.

B.. The increasing complexity in the division of labor.

Technology, as applied, creates a more complicated division of labor. This can be seen in the assembly lines, in research and development, and "systems engineering". Technology has also been applied to the area of communications and human organization. Thus, corporate hierarchies are far more differentiated in this period -- far more workers spend time supervising, co-ordinating and analyzing other workers than ever before. The separation between "worker" and "boss" is now much more complex. Technology has also meant that more and more workers offer technical expertise in the process of material production rather than physical labor power.

The changes described in A and B above have important consequences for an analysis of the proletariat.

1. The complex nature of technological society requires that a part of the work force no longer engaged in creating material wealth acts to service those who do. Keeping garbage picked up, traffic flowing smoothly, food services, day care services, recreational services to those who do the actual material production of the society

keeps a number of workers engaged in service production. These workers are in a direct relationship to the industrial/point of production sector. It would be impossible for the industrial worker to get to work if the DSR driver didn't drive him or the mechanic fix his car, if the street department didn't plow the snow, if the schools didn't educate his kids/her kids. Service workers act (one step removed) to : material production and surplus value. Few would argue that the maintenance man in a plant who fixes a broken machine for an assembly line worker is NOT a member of the proletariat. But the industrial nurse who fixes the "human machine" is just as much a member of the proletariat; the teacher who teaches the new little machines to read, write and go to work on time also has the same essential relationship to the line workers as the maintenance repairman.

The growth of the service sector is required because technology demands that workers do on a social level what was once possible on an individual level. A careful reading of the Dollmaker makes this very clear. Coming to Detroit, Gertie found herself relying on a host of workers to do things for her family that she or her husband had done for themselves before. The complexity of life in Detroit demanded a complex supportive service working sector.

2. As the proletariat grows the number (and proportion) of workers in that class most directly opposed to the bourgeoisie is growing. This is the class which most directly experiences the fundamental contradictions of capitalism (lay-offs, depressions, racism, etc.) This is the class in whose interest it is to overthrow the bourgeoisie. This is the class whose relationship to socialized production makes them most able to understand their power and the potentiality of socialism.

The growth of the proletariat means that the mechanisms of ideological control and persuasion become more important and more sophisticated. Ideological instill in other workers the beliefs and attitudes necessary to maintain the work force -- the service and industrial workers. They service the mental functioning of the human machine. Education workers and intellectual workers are service workers because they teach the skills necessary for material survival to other workers. But education, intellectual workers, and religious workers also teach the why of such skills and are thus also ideological workers. Other ideological workers teach few skills and teach almost only values, beliefs and ideology (ministers, philosophers, historians, etc.) And some ideological workers create and disseminate "culture". It is a culture designed to justify and rationalize the primary contradictions and to glorify the divisions within the class, project individualism, and teach the inevitable evil nature of human beings. But such cultural workers sell their cultural skills and labor power to the bourgeoisie and face the contradictions of exploitation, powerlessness and alienation. (IE one assumes that a staff artist for Disney studio would rather be a Diego Rivera... ) Again, those cultural workers who receive high compensation, or control and direct other workers are not part of the proletariat.

There are three important points which need to be emphasized in terms of ideological workers as part of the proletariat. Because there are more workers who now belong to the proletariat and because they now share a material basis for unity, it is more necessary to create ideology which says they do not! If the bourgeoisie can no longer divide workers on the basis of real material interests, then workers must be divided on the basis of perceived superstructural differences. As technology makes the productive process more complicated it becomes harder to control workers by force and more necessary to control workers ideologically.

Secondly, the historical failures of capitalism and the existence of real socialist alternatives requires complex "lines" by which continued poverty,



alienation, social unrest, and war can be explained to the working class. The development of radio, TV, mass newspapers and national magazines has had an important affect on the proletariat. The bourgeoisie require a host of sociologists, political scientists, and economists to develop theories and explanations for these failures. But just as a line worker understands the contradiction of creating surplus value in his work, many social scientists perceive the contradictions of the reality they observe and the myths they are paid to perpetrate. And in both cases awareness of the contradictions does not lead necessarily to proletarian consciousness but may lead only to localized and economist-type demands.

Thirdly, the bourgeoisie has learned to apply technology to the superstructure as well as to material production. Just as Marx developed a revolutionary science of society, so the bourgeoisie has developed the social sciences of manipulation and control. Psychologists, industrial relations experts, school counselors, criminologists are all paid to maintain the mental health and proper attitudes of the other workers.

These points are made to emphasize the fact that even the workers in the realm of "production of ideas" who are exploited, who sell their labor, and who do not control their means of production, are critically important to the bourgeoisie. The disruption of that ideological production can have real and concrete affects on the process of general social production. Its affects would, however, occur in different ways over different time periods for ideological workers are two/three steps removed from the direct process of material production.

There is another important part to the social organization of labor in this period. Part of Marx's definition of the proletariat centered on the process of production which was inherently socialized. The industrial proletariat was the leading force for Marx because it understood the necessity of socialized labor. Today, the work experiences of many more workers includes an understanding of socialized production. The corporate form (which includes the corporate bureaucracy of the state) places workers in highly complex interdependent relationships to one another. Education workers, postal workers, McDonald's cooks -- can all understand that their product depends on the work of many other, different kinds of workers.

Corporate institutions of works are not only interdependent to one another but are also interdependent in terms of the "private" economy and the state. In this period, the state serves the interest of the bourgeoisie by assuming a training, maintenance, and supportive function. GM could operate elementary schools to train future GM workers, but instead the state runs the schools. GM could operate social services for workers it lays off, but instead the state runs welfare. And the state socialization of these services increases workers' understanding of interdependency. (Although at the same time the class has historically attempted to bring such institutions under its own control whenever possible (the co-operative movement).

IV. ...by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it...

This criterion of class is critical in this period. This criterion has been most successfully used to divide the proletariat and confuse the thinking of class analysts in this country. The bourgeoisie has succeed in making the criterion of income and consumption the "objective" criterion for distinguishing classes. Marx argued that the question was one of wealth and wealth disposal/power over productive means was the distinguishing feature dividing the proletariat and bourgeoisie. According



to bourgeois ideology, the "real" difference between classes depends on whether one is salaried or earns wages, whether one listens to Beethoven or bluegrass, whether one gets "professional" raises or union-won raises, how one talks, and what color one is. The issue, then, is not whether one earns a living from having control over the means of production and receiving income from someone else's labor versus whether one earns a living from one's own labor. And the issue is not then whether one disposes of wealth by using it to create power, more wealth, and control or whether one disposes of wealth to meet basic material needs and survival.

It is true that the proletariat is differentiated in many ways -- including income, job security, and consumption. But these variations are miniscule compared to the differences between the income and wealth of the proletariat and the income and wealth of the bourgeoisie.

This myth around the nature of class in the US is based partly on the capacity of the bourgeoisie to give different rewards to various sectors of the class, particularly those who did work in terms of supervising other workers or those who did work which required formal credentials. But as the opposition of the industrial work force mounted with the union movement of the country, the bourgeoisie was forced to give some of production workers better pay, drawing on the super-exploitation of Black, Brown and Red people and women in this country and third world peoples. But these contradictions have begun to flatten out. "Privileged" sectors of the class have found their relative advantages increasingly eaten up by higher taxes, higher costs of living, greater job insecurity. The bourgeoisie has found itself facing more resistant and militant third world and women workers, and lessening the ability of the bourgeoisie to rob Peter in order to pay Paul (or rob Mary in order to pay Susan).

At the same time that the bourgeoisie has been increasingly forced to eliminate some privileges for technical and ideological workers in terms of control at work. Productivity demands are now not only hitting point of production workers, they are hitting technical, professional, and ideological workers as well.

The contradictions between workers within the proletariat may not have, in our analysis, a material basis. But they are "real" in the sense that if workers accept bourgeois ideology and rational for privilege, class prejudice and disrespect, those beliefs do operate to divide the class. And, as secondary contradictions these differences may appear primary and may demand analysis and resolution as a primary focus of attention. But one must be careful to approach such contradictions as being, in essence, secondary, in order to heighten the fundamental contradiction. We must accelerate the forces that will make the fundamental contradictions more evident to the class.

It is up to us to organize the people. As for the reactionaries in China, it is up to us to organize the people to overthrow them. Everything reactionary is the same; if you don't hit it, it won't fall. This is also like sweeping the floor; as a rule, where the broom does not reach, the dust will not vanish of itself.

Mao, Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 19

## SECOND PART

In the course of struggle, however, the demarcation between the correct and the erroneous lines should be drawn with care and accuracy, so that the struggle between the two lines and the two ideologies is waged correctly and actively.

"Communists should Work for the Interests of the Vast Majority of People" Hung Yuan, Peking Review, #49, Dec. 7, 1973

Whatever is true never poses to bluff people into silence and then return home in triumph. Such pretentiousness will not help bring truth to light but will be an obstacle to its discovery. Whatever is true never poses to bluff people; it talks and acts simply and honestly. Two terms used to appear in the articles and speeches of some comrades; one was "ruthless struggle" and the other "Merciless blows". These measures are entirely necessary in coping with the enemy and the enemy ideology, but it is wrong to apply them to our own comrades... Against our enemies, we must beyond doubt adopt the measures of waging ruthless struggle and dealing merciless blows because they are applying the same measures against the Party... But we should not employ the same measures against comrades who have occasionally committed a mistake; in their case we should apply the method of criticism and self-criticism...

Mao, "Oppose the Party 'Eight-Legged Essay', p. 51 (emphasis added, TEP)

The following is a loose outline of the overlapping questions and positions which we have been able to identify within the organization. The positions outlined are vague and unclear because people have not accurately "drawn" the lines. This leaves cadre to draw their own conclusions from the limited perceptive data and much second-hand analysis. This leaves too much area for subjectivity and not correct, active struggle.

Cadre need to think through their positions and those cadre with forming positions must clarify them for the organization. We need to discover which positions are mutually exclusive of each other and what positions are shades of the same, unclear political line. We need to discover which positions are fundamental, theoretical differences and what positions are differences in strategy or tactics.

The questions facing us appear to have always existed within the organization, but the heightened political level and practise of the organization and of cadre has raised the demand for a solidified, united political line. This, combined with shifting power within the organization, is transforming us in the intense struggle we find ourselves in. Priorities are essential, but we must be clear as to the effects of the positions that we take. As they going to be "either/or" exclusive positions, or primary/secondary considerations of a political line with tactical evaluations of each program or work place? Are they going to be so broad as to not actually give us priorities off of which to determine limited areas of work we can actually sustain?

COMRADES, WE MUST KNOW THE POLITICAL QUESTIONS TO BE ABLE TO HAVE POLITICAL STRUGGLE!

I. A. The fundamental contradiction for us today is between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Therefore, the main focus of our organizing efforts should be around the social relations which derive from the work place (commodity production and service production). The priority is to organize and develop leadership at the place of work.

VS.

B. The fundamental contradiction for us today is between imperialism and the the oppressed nations. Place of work organizing is too narrow. The class develops many forms and Marxists-Leninists must give political leadership to as many as possible. Many political people do not develop through Trade union/place of work struggles.

II. The trade union is the main form of the class, therefore we must work mainly within them; to the exclusion of forms which are not potentially trade unionist or related to the work place  
(This position must be approached from the understanding that: 1) this is the actual position of some cadre? and 2) that some cadre interpret the "place of work" position to be only this?)



VS.

The Trade union is only one form of the class. We should relate to all forms generated by the class which raise potential of developing revolutionaries whether they related to work place or not.

III. Communist Party/Mass Party-United Front

- A. The building blocks of both a CP and a Mass/United Front develop simultaneously, therefore we cannot ignore the one while building the other

VS.

- B.1. One cannot have a CP without first having a mass/united front

OR

2. One cannot have a mass/united front without first having a CP.

Obviously all of these are interrelated. One being amore sophisticated position of the other, with some people tending to fall on one side in one of them, and on the other side in others. We need to know if anyone actually holds these positions and if so what aspects of them. We need to exactly what is the struggle!

We stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Party and the revolutionray organizations in the interest of our fight. Every Communist and revolutionary should take up this weapon.

But liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to decadent, philistine attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the Party and the revolutionary organizations.

"Combat Liberalism", Selected Works, Mao, Vol II, p. 31